



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,237	04/13/2001	Robert Van Kommer	33226	6191

116 7590 03/02/2006

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2655

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/835,237	KOMMER, ROBERT VAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Huyen X. Vo	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6, 20-28, 30-35, 44-49, 51(30-35), and 51(44-49) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saylor et al. (US 6792086).

3. Regarding claims 1, 30, and 51(30), Saylor et al. disclose a voice portal hosting system, intended to be connected to a first voice telecommunication network in order for a plurality of users in said network to establish a connection with the system using voice equipment, said system comprising: a memory in which a plurality of interactive voice response applications providing interactive response functionality is stored, each of said applications including an executable component for execution by said hosting system (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45*); and uploading means for independently uploading said plurality of interactive voice response applications through a second telecommunication network by a plurality of independent value-added service providers (*col. 20, line 64 to col. 21, line 45 and or referring to figure 3, content provider 70 provides information to VPAGE Server 22*), wherein at least a plurality of said

plurality of interactive voice response applications uses a common speech recognition module for executing on said system and for utilizing common speech models associated with users (*text-to-speech 37 and speech recognizer 39 in figure 7 and/or referring to col. 26, lines 47-65 and/or col. 10, lines 15-38. Also, it is inherent for a speech recognition system to include speech recognition models*), and further wherein said system is adapted to execute said voice response application when one of said users calls said system (*col. 10, lines 15-38*).

4. Regarding claims 2-6, 31-35, and 51(31-35), Saylor et al. further disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein said common speech recognition module comprises a common user profile database (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), and wherein said common user profile database includes user preferences (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), and wherein said user preferences include a delivery address for goods and/or services ordered with said value-added service providers (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), wherein said user preferences include a billing address and/or preferences for goods and services ordered with said value-added service providers (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), wherein said common speech recognition module uses user-specific speech models (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15, voice print authentication*).

5. Regarding claims 20-28, 44-49, and 51(44-49), Saylor et al. further disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications use a common billing module and a common clearing center for

Art Unit: 2655

dispatching the collected amounts to said value-added service providers (*Billing Module 46 in figure 2*), wherein said common billing module allows for the billing of transactions between said users and said value-added service providers on a common bill prepared by the operator of said voice portal hosting system (*Billing Module 46 in figure 2*), and wherein at least a plurality of said users have a deposit account on said voice portal hosting system which can be used for transactions with a plurality of said value-added service providers (*Billing Module 46 in figure 2*), wherein at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications use a user authentication module based on an electronic signature and/or on biometric parameters of said users (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15, voice print authentication*), wherein said second telecommunication network is a TCP/IP network (*col. 14, lines 5-25 and/or referring to network 20 in figures 1-3*), wherein at least some of said interactive voice response applications are described with VoiceXML documents (*col. 21, lines 10-45*), wherein at least one free interactive voice response application is made available by the operator of the system (*col. 21, lines 10-45*), and wherein said free interactive voice response application includes a free directory assistance service (*col. 36, line 53 to col. 37, line 8*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7-12, 15, 18-19, 29, 36-39, 42-43, 50, 51(36-39), 51(42-43), and 51(50) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. (US 6792086) in view of Maes (US 6073101).

8. Regarding claims 29, 50, and 51(50), Saylor et al. disclose a voice portal hosting system, intended to be connected to a first voice telecommunication network in order for a plurality of users in said network to establish a connection with said system using a voice equipment (*figure 12*), said system comprising a memory in which a plurality of interactive voice response applications providing interactive voice response functionality have been independently uploaded through a second telecommunication network by a plurality of independent value-added service providers (*VPAGE Database 50 in figure 3, voice response application includes TML, XML, VoiceXML, WML, and others in col. 21, lines 10-45, and col. 20, line 64 to col. 21, line 45 and or referring to figure 3, content provider 70 provides information to VPAGE Server 22*), wherein at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications uses a common speech recognition module run on said system (*text-to-speech 37 and speech recognizer 39 in figure 7 and/or referring to col. 26, lines 47-65 and/or col. 10, lines 15-38. Also, it is inherent for a speech recognition system to include speech recognition models*), wherein said common speech recognition module comprises a common user profile database including user preferences (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*), and further wherein said

system is adapted to execute said voice response application when one of said users calls said system (*col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 15*).

Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose that common speech recognition module further uses common user-specific speech models, wherein said system further comprises means for adapting said common speech models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications. However, Maes teaches a common speech recognition module further uses common user-specific speech models (*col. 6, line 47 to col. 7, line 10*), wherein said system further comprises means for adapting said common speech models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications (*col. 5, lines 1 to col. 6, line 67*).

Since Saylor et al. and Maes are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Maes in order to improve speech recognition accuracy.

9. Regarding claims 7-8, 36, and 51(36), Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein said common speech recognition module uses user-specific speech models, means for adapting said common speech models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications, and wherein said means for adapting said common speech models uses recorded users' speech samples for adapting said

Art Unit: 2655

common speech models off-line. However, Maes teaches speech recognition module using user-specific speech models (*col. 6, line 47 to col. 7, line 10*), means for adapting said common speech models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications (*col. 5, lines 1 to col. 6, line 67*), and wherein said means for adapting said common speech models uses recorded users' speech samples for adapting said common speech models off-line (*col. 5, lines 1 to col. 6, line 67*).

Since Saylor et al. and Maes are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Maes in order to improve speech recognition accuracy.

10. Regarding claims 9-10, Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice portal hosting system of claim 1, wherein said common speech recognition module uses Hidden Markov Models, and further comprising a Hidden Markov Models adaptation module for adapting said models to said user, and wherein said Hidden Markov Models adaptation module allows for an incremental adaptation of said models. However, Maes teaches a common speech recognition module uses Hidden Markov Models, and further comprising a Hidden Markov Models adaptation module for adapting said models to said user (*col. 6, lines 40-60*), and wherein said Hidden Markov Models adaptation module allows for an incremental adaptation of said models (*col. 5, lines 1 to col. 6, line 67*).

Since Saylor et al. and Maes are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Maes in order to improve speech recognition accuracy.

11. Regarding claims 11-12, 37-38, and 51(37-38), Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein said common speech recognition module uses user-specific language models, and means for adapting said common language models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications. However, Maes teaches a common speech recognition module uses user-specific language models (*col. 5, lines 1 to col. 6, line 67*), and means for adapting said common language models associated to a user during each dialogue between said user and each of said interactive voice response applications (*col. 5, lines 1 to col. 6, line 67*).

Since Saylor et al. and Maes are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Maes in order to improve speech recognition accuracy.

12. Regarding claims 15, 18-19, 39, 42-43, 51(39), and 51(42-43), Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose the voice portal hosting system, wherein at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications use a common user identification module run on

said system, wherein said user identification module uses a voice-based user identification module, wherein said common speech recognition module uses a speaker-dependant speech recognition algorithm, and wherein said speaker is identified by said common user identification module. However, Maes further teaches that at least a plurality of said interactive voice response applications use a common user identification module run on said system, wherein said user identification module uses a voice-based user identification module, wherein said common speech recognition module uses a speaker-dependant speech recognition algorithm, and wherein said speaker is identified by said common user identification module (*referring to the operation of figure 1 and/or col. 5, line 1 to col. 6, line 67*).

Since Saylor et al. and Maes are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Maes in order to identify the user and the user's profile for used by the speech recognition to improve speech recognition accuracy.

13. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. (US 6792086) in view Beyda et al. (US 6487277).

14. Regarding claims 13-14, Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose a voice portal hosting system of claim 1, wherein said common speech recognition module uses selections previously made by said users, and wherein said selections previously made

by said users are stored in said voice portal hosting system for improving the arborescence of the menus. However, Beyda et al. teach common speech recognition module uses selections previously made by said users, and wherein said selections previously made by said users are stored in said voice portal hosting system for improving the arborescence of the menus (*see abstract*).

Since Saylor et al. and Beyda et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Beyda et al. in order to tailor the presentation order to the needs of each individual user to improve system's efficiency.

15. Claims 16-17, 40-41, 51(40-41) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al. (US 6792086) in view of Woods et al. (US 6510417).

16. Regarding claims 16-17, 40-41, and 51(40-41), Saylor et al. fail to specifically disclose that the user identification module uses an identification of the equipment used by said user in said first telecommunication network, and being operated by a telecom operator of said first telecommunication network, wherein said user identification module uses an identification of the equipment used by said user in said first telecommunication network even when said identification is not available for the other B-subscribers of said first telecommunication network. However, Woods et al. teach that the user identification module uses an identification of the equipment used by said

user in said first telecommunication network, and being operated by a telecom operator of said first telecommunication network, wherein said user identification module uses an identification of the equipment used by said user in said first telecommunication network even when said identification is not available for the other B-subscribers of said first telecommunication network (*col. 24, lines 39-41*).

Since Saylor et al. and Woods et al. are analogous art because they are from the same endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Saylor et al. by incorporating the teaching of Woods et al. in order to allow the system to automatically authenticate users based on their phone numbers by using caller-ID procedure.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HXV

2/24/2006


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER